

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action dated December 15, 2009. Claims 1-26 are pending and stand rejected in the outstanding Office Action.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over JP 05-96834, in view of Whitney et al. (US 2006/0250707), is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner stated that JP 05-96834 teaches all the limitations of the claim except for specifically disclosing that “the backlight irradiates the micro lens with higher directivity in the first direction at angle or irradiation along the first direction than at angle along the second direction”, and turned to Whitney for the missing limitation.

Whitney (US 2006/0250707), which was cited, as allegedly providing the missing limitation that the backlight radiation is higher in directivity along the first direction than along the second direction, is disqualified as prior art under 35 USC §103 via 35 USC §102(a), because the filing date of Whitney (US ‘707), May 5, 2005, is later than the foreign priority date, February 27, 2004 of the present application, MPEP 2136.03 I. Applicant has filed herewith an English translation (and statement of accuracy) of the certified priority document in order to perfect the foreign priority date of the present application and overcome the prior art rejections citing Whitney (US ‘707), MPEP 706.02(b)(E).

The rejection of independent claims 1, 16 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Kurematsu (JP 03-184019 corresponding to US 5,101,279) in view of Colgan et al. (US 2003/0214615) and further in view of Whitney, is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Whitney cannot be considered as prior art relative to the instant application.

Moreover, Whitney fails to teach the limitation “the backlight irradiates the micro lens array with light that is higher in directivity at an angle of irradiation along the first direction than at an angle of irradiation along the second direction”.

Whitney merely teaches that an optical film placed adjacent to the micro lens array emits light with different directivity along X and Y directions. Whitney does not disclose controlling the directivity of light emitted from the backlight so that the directivity along Y direction is higher than along the X direction.

For the above reasons, claims 1, 16 and 19-22 are allowable.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-15, 17-18 and 23-26, each dependent from claim 1, or 16, also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Leonidas Boutsikaris/
Leonidas Boutsikaris
Reg. No. 61,377

LB:tlm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100